AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAIMS:

This listing of claims will replace all prior versions, and listings, of claims in the application:

1. (currently amended) A gas cooled dynamoelectric machine, comprising:

a rotor having a body portion, said rotor having axially extending coils and end turns defining a plurality of endwindings extending axially beyond at least one end of said body portion; and

at least one spaceblock located between adjacent said endwindings so as to define a cavity therebetween, said spaceblock having first and second sidewall portions engaging said adjacent endwindings, an upstream wall, and a downstream wall, said downstream wall of said spaceblock having a ~~non-planar~~ convexly curved, aerodynamic contour for reducing the extent and strength of the generated wake.

Claim 2. (cancel)

3. (currently amended) The dynamoelectric machine of ~~claim 2~~ claim 1, wherein said downstream wall is defined as a generally parabolic curve.

4. (original) The dynamoelectric machine of claim 1, wherein said upstream wall is generally planar.

5. (original) The dynamoelectric machine of claim 1, wherein said spaceblock is comprised of a generally rectangular main body portion and a protrusion portion, said main body portion defining said upstream wall and said sidewall portions, and said protrusion portion defining said downstream wall.

6. (original) The dynamoelectric machine of claim 5, wherein said downstream wall is defined as a generally parabolic curve.

7. (original) The dynamoelectric machine of claim 5, wherein said upstream wall is generally planar.

8. (original) The dynamoelectric machine of claim 5, wherein said protrusion portion is integrally formed with said main body portion.

9. (currently amended) A gas cooled dynamoelectric machine, comprising:

a rotor having a spindle and a body portion;

a rotor winding comprising axially extending coils disposed on said body portion and spaced, concentric endwindings extending axially beyond at least one end of said body portion, said endwindings and said spindle defining an annular space therebetween;

a plurality of spaceblocks located between adjacent ones of said endwindings thereby to define a plurality of cavities, each bounded by adjacent spaceblocks and adjacent endwindings and open to said annular space; and

each said spaceblock having first and second sidewall portions engaging said adjacent endwindings, an upstream wall, and a downstream wall, said downstream wall of at least one of said spaceblocks having ~~a non-planar~~ convexly curved, aerodynamic contour for reducing the extent and strength of the generated wake.

Claim 10. (cancel)

11. (currently amended) The dynamoelectric machine of ~~claim 10~~ claim 9, wherein said non-planar downstream wall is defined as a generally parabolic curve.

12. (original) The dynamoelectric machine of claim 9, wherein said upstream wall of each said spaceblock is generally planar.

13. (currently amended) The dynamoelectric machine of ~~claim 1~~ claim 9, wherein said at least one spaceblock is comprised of a generally rectangular main body portion and a protrusion portion, said main body portion defining said upstream wall and said sidewall portions, and said protrusion portion defining said ~~non-planar~~ convexly curved, aerodynamic downstream wall.

14. (original) The dynamoelectric machine of claim 13, wherein said downstream wall is defined as a generally parabolic curve.

15. (original) The dynamoelectric machine of claim 13, wherein said upstream wall is generally planar.

16. (original) The dynamoelectric machine of claim 13, wherein said protrusion portion is integrally formed with said main body portion.

17. (previously presented) The dynamoelectric machine of claim 1, further comprising a rotor spindle extending axially beyond said at least one end of said body portion and defining an annular space with said endwindings, and wherein said at least one spaceblock extends radially into said annular space.

18. (previously presented) The dynamoelectric machine of claim 9, wherein said plurality of spaceblocks extend radially into said annular space.

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3-9, 11-18 are now pending.

In the Official Action, claims 1-2, 4-5, 7, 9-10, 12-13, 15 and 17-18 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Staub et al. The Examiner takes the position that the downstream wall of Staub, labeled and interpreted as surfaces 101 and 102, has a non-planar/aerodynamic contour. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Although the downstream wall of Staub is provided as a stepped structure, each downstream wall portion 101 and 102 is planar. Even accepting that because of the presence of the step between the wall portions 101 and 102, the downstream wall as a whole is "non-planar". The Examiner's characterization of this stepped, planar downstream wall as aerodynamic is not well taken. In this regard, a planar downstream wall, even stepped as in Staub, would not be considered by the skilled artisan to have an "aerodynamic" contour. Moreover, the goal of Staub's invention had nothing to do with the downstream wake much less reducing downstream wake.

To clarify the meaning of aerodynamic without limiting the invention to the presently preferred parabolic curvature, claims 1 and 9 have been amended above to explicitly provide that the downstream wall has a "convexly curved, aerodynamic contour" for "reducing the extent and strength" of the generated wake. Thus, these claims have been amended to incorporate the limitations of dependent claims 2 and 10, respectively, and to introduce the convexly curved feature more specifically recited in claims 3 and 11 as a parabolic curve. Thus, even if Staub's stepped downstream wall is characterized as non-planar, it is certainly not aerodynamic and, with reference to claims 1 and 9, is not and would not be interpreted as being convexly curved.

Thus, the invention recited in claims 1 and 9 is not anticipated by Staub nor would it be obvious to the skilled artisan for consideration of the Staub disclosure.

Claims 8 and 16 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as unpatentable over Staub et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Although the Examiner argues that it would be obvious to form a protrusion portion integrally with a main body portion, it is respectfully submitted that Staub does not teach forming his spaceblock in two pieces in the first place. Thus, was is lacking in Staub and not taught in the prior art cited by the Examiner is the concept of forming a spaceblock to include a protrusion portion and a main body portion that are not formed integrally and wherein the protrusion portion has a non-planar downstream wall, much less one having an aerodynamic, convexly curved configuration.

Thus, the Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed. In any event the claims are submitted to be patentable over Staub for the reasons advanced above. Indeed, whether Staub's spaceblocks are formed in one piece or from multiple pieces, there is still no teaching or suggestion of a convexly curved downstream wall as recited in claims 1 and 9.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and an early Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: 

Michelle N. Lester
Reg. No. 32,331

MNL:slj
1100 North Glebe Road, 8th Floor
Arlington, VA 22201-4714
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100